

1 ROB BONTA  
 Attorney General of California  
 2 MYUNG J. PARK  
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
 3 KATHERINE GAUMOND, State Bar No. 349453  
 CAITLAN MCLOON, State Bar No. 302798  
 4 CECILIA D. SEGAL, State Bar No. 310935  
 EMMANUELLE S. SOICHER, State Bar No. 290754  
 5 M. ELAINE MECKENSTOCK, State Bar No. 268861  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 6 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
 P.O. Box 70550  
 7 Oakland, CA 94612-0550  
 Telephone: (510) 879-0299  
 8 Fax: (510) 622-2270  
 E-mail: Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov  
 9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California*  
 (additional counsel on signature pages)  
 10

11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 12 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 13 OAKLAND DIVISION  
 14

15 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, STATE OF**  
 16 **COLORADO, STATE OF DELAWARE,**  
 17 **COMMONWEALTH OF**  
 18 **MASSACHUSETTS, STATE OF NEW**  
 19 **JERSEY, STATE OF NEW MEXICO,**  
 20 **STATE OF NEW YORK, STATE OF**  
 21 **OREGON, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,**  
 22 **STATE OF VERMONT, and STATE OF**  
 23 **WASHINGTON,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

24 **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S.**  
 25 **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**  
 26 **AGENCY, LEE ZELDIN, in his official**  
 capacity as Administrator of the U.S.  
 Environmental Protection Agency, and  
**DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity**  
 as President of the United States,

Defendants.

4:25-cv-04966-HSG

**PLAINTIFF STATES' NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTIONS**

(Administrative Procedure Act,  
5 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.; 5 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.)

**Trial Date:** None Set

**Action filed:** June 12, 2025

**Judge:** Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-13, Plaintiffs State of California et al. (hereinafter  
 2 “Plaintiff States”) respectfully submit this Notice of Pendency of Other Actions.

3 **A. SUMMARY OF THIS ACTION**

4 California has been regulating motor vehicle emissions for more than 60 years. Indeed, it  
 5 was doing so before the federal government entered the field. Compl. ¶ 1, ECF No. 1. Since 1967,  
 6 when Congress generally preempted States from setting new motor vehicle standards, California  
 7 has done so pursuant to the preemption waivers that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
 8 (EPA) must grant, subject to certain limited conditions. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7543(b)(1); Compl. ¶¶ 1-  
 9 2. Earlier this year, the federal government took the unprecedented and unlawful step of targeting,  
 10 with resolutions of disapproval (Resolutions), three such preemption waivers that EPA had  
 11 already granted by adjudication. Compl. ¶¶ 4-10.

12 Each of the three waivers targeted by the Resolutions permits California to enforce specific  
 13 amendments to its regulatory program, adopted to reduce harmful pollution and protect public  
 14 health and welfare. Other States may enforce California’s regulations as their own, should they  
 15 choose to adopt them. 42 U.S.C. § 7507. The first waiver at issue, published in April 2023 (88  
 16 Fed. Reg. 20,688 (Apr. 6, 2023)), permits enforcement of the Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT)  
 17 regulation, which requires gradual increases in sales of medium- and heavy-duty zero-emission  
 18 vehicles in California beginning with model year 2024. Compl. ¶ 44. The second and third  
 19 waivers, published in early January 2025, permits enforcement of the Advanced Clean Cars II  
 20 (ACCII) and Omnibus regulations, respectively. 90 Fed. Reg. 642 (Jan. 6, 2025); 90 Fed. Reg.  
 21 643 (Jan. 6, 2025). ACCII gradually strengthens California’s longstanding emission standards for  
 22 light-duty vehicles (passenger cars and light trucks), including the State’s zero-emission-vehicle  
 23 sales requirements and the exhaust emission standards for criteria pollutants, requiring reductions  
 24 in smog-forming oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and particulate matter. Compl. ¶ 43. The Omnibus  
 25 regulation likewise strengthens longstanding state emission standards, requiring substantial  
 26 reductions in NOx exhaust emissions from new medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. *Id.* ¶ 45.

27 The unlawful targeting of these waivers began months (or, in the case of ACT, years) after  
 28 the waivers were granted. EPA suddenly reversed the view it had consistently held for decades—

1 a view shared by the Government Accountability Office—and declared, without explanation, that  
 2 waivers were “rules” to be reported to Congress under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). *Id.*  
 3 ¶¶ 65, 68-70, 73-77. Deferring entirely to that post-hoc and unexplained labeling, Congress used  
 4 extraordinary, expedited procedures to enact joint resolutions that purport to invalidate the three  
 5 waivers. *Id.* ¶¶ 94, 103, 108. The President signed the Resolutions on June 12, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 113.  
 6 Plaintiff States sued the United States the same day. Plaintiff States seek, *inter alia*, to have the  
 7 Resolutions declared unconstitutional for violation of separation-of-powers and federalism  
 8 principles. *Id.* ¶¶ 153-178.

9       The United States responded to Plaintiff States’ complaint on September 19, 2025. ECF No.  
 10 118. The Zero Emission Transportation Association has moved (unopposed) to intervene as a  
 11 plaintiff, ECF No. 43, and numerous entities—the American Free Enterprise Chamber of  
 12 Commerce (AmFree), several trade associations, and the State of Texas—have moved to  
 13 intervene as defendants, ECF Nos. 49, 61, 86, 92, 112. A hearing on the motions to intervene is  
 14 calendared for October 23, 2025. ECF Nos. 87, 97, 114.

15       **B. SUMMARY OF OTHER ACTIONS**

16       **1. *Daimler Truck N. Am. LLC v. Cal. Air Res. Bd.*, No. 2:25-cv-02255-DC**  
 17 **(E.D. Cal. filed Aug. 11, 2025)**

18       Sixty days after Plaintiff States commenced this suit, Daimler Truck North America, LLC;  
 19 International Motors, LLC; PACCAR, Inc.; and Volvo Group North America LLC filed a  
 20 complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California against the California  
 21 Air Resources Board (CARB) and two California State officials: Steven S. Cliff, in his official  
 22 capacity as the Executive Officer of CARB, and Gavin Newsom, in his official capacity as the  
 23 Governor of California (collectively, the “California defendants”). Compl., *Daimler*, ECF No. 1.<sup>1</sup>  
 24 A true and correct copy of that complaint is attached as Exhibit A. The complaint asserts claims  
 25 that, in part, raise issues overlapping with the claims asserted here. Specifically, the *Daimler*  
 26 plaintiffs allege that the Resolutions render parts of the ACCII regulation, and all of the ACT and

27  
 28 

---

<sup>1</sup> For ease of reference, this notice uses Daimler for all citations to Docket No. 2:25-cv-02255-DC (E.D. Cal.).

1      Omnibus regulations, preempted. Ex. A, ¶ 74(a). To defeat these claims, the California  
 2      defendants will argue, *inter alia*, that the Resolutions are invalid, so claims at issue in the present  
 3      matter will operate as defenses in the *Daimler* matter. Likely anticipating that overlap, the United  
 4      States and EPA (collectively, “United States”) moved to intervene as plaintiffs in *Daimler*; the  
 5      court granted the motion on August 20, 2025. Minute Order, *Daimler*, ECF No. 54. The United  
 6      States’ complaint-in-intervention, *Daimler*, ECF No. 56, a true and correct copy of which is  
 7      attached as Exhibit B, alleges, among other things, that the ACT and Omnibus regulations are  
 8      preempted. Ex. B, ¶¶ 103-105, 108-109.

9            The parties in *Daimler* are currently briefing a preliminary injunction motion, filed by the  
 10     plaintiffs and later joined by the United States. The California defendants’ opposition, *Daimler*,  
 11     ECF No. 73, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit C, raised issues that overlap  
 12     with those in this suit. Ex. C, Arg. II.B. Briefing on the motion will be completed by October 14,  
 13     2025; the hearing on the motion is set for October 31, 2025. Minute Order, *Daimler*, ECF No. 54.

14           Additionally, on August 20, 2025, the court in the *Daimler* matter ordered the parties to  
 15     show cause why the action “should not be transferred to the Northern District of California, a  
 16     district in which th[e] action could have been filed and in which an arguably related case with  
 17     substantially similar parties and issues”—*i.e.*, the present suit—“is pending.” Minute Order,  
 18     *Daimler*, ECF No. 55. The *Daimler* plaintiffs contended that their action could not have been  
 19     filed in the Northern District and, in any event, declined to consent to transfer. Pls.’ Resp. to  
 20     Order to Show Cause 1, *Daimler*, ECF No. 62 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)). The United States  
 21     asserted that this suit and *Daimler* are unrelated and that transfer is unwarranted. United States’  
 22     Resp. to Order to Show Cause 1, *Daimler*, ECF No. 59. The California defendants explained that  
 23     the *Daimler* action could have been filed in the Northern District and did not object to transfer to  
 24     this Court, pointing out that both actions “raise the same untested questions about the  
 25     constitutionality of the Resolutions” and that transfer “would advance judicial economy and  
 26     minimize the risk of conflicting judgments.” Defs.’ Resp. to Order to Show Cause 4-7, *Daimler*,  
 27     ECF No. 61. On September 8, the court discharged the order to show cause and directed that the  
 28     case remain pending in the Eastern District. Minute Order, *Daimler*, ECF No. 72.

1       **2. Am. Free Enter. Chamber of Com. v. Engine Mfrs. Ass'n, No. 3:24-cv-50504**  
 2       **(N.D. Ill. filed Dec. 16, 2024)**

3           AmFree filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois  
 4 challenging a 2023 agreement between CARB and several heavy-duty truck manufacturers  
 5 known as the Clean Truck Partnership. In Plaintiff States' view, AmFree's case does not  
 6 presently include substantial overlap in subject matter and/or parties with the present matter.  
 7 Plaintiff States nonetheless include the case in this notice out of an abundance of caution.

8           AmFree's suit, filed six months before the enactment of the Resolutions at issue here,  
 9 alleges that the Clean Truck Partnership is itself a preempted emission standard or a preempted  
 10 attempt to enforce certain emission standards, including ACT and Omnibus. AmFree named as  
 11 defendants the manufacturers and trade association who signed the agreement and Steven S. Cliff,  
 12 in his official capacity as Executive Officer of CARB. AmFree later amended the complaint to  
 13 add allegations about the Resolutions, once signed, and to remove the private-party defendants  
 14 from the action following an undisclosed out-of-court settlement with them. A true and correct  
 15 copy of the operative complaint, *AmFree*, ECF No. 142, is attached as Exhibit D.<sup>2</sup>

16           On August 13, 2025, the United States and EPA (collectively, the "United States") moved  
 17 to intervene as plaintiffs. *AmFree*, ECF No. 121. Like plaintiff AmFree, the United States alleges  
 18 that the Clean Truck Partnership is preempted. *Id.*, Ex. A, ¶¶ 110-114. The United States'  
 19 proposed complaint-in-intervention also alleges that certain California emission standards,  
 20 including ACT and Omnibus, are preempted, citing, *inter alia*, the Resolutions. *Id.* ¶¶ 98-109.  
 21 The United States' motion to intervene remains pending.

22           On August 14, 2025, Defendant Cliff moved to dismiss AmFree's suit for lack of personal  
 23 jurisdiction and lack of proper venue or, in the alternative, to transfer the action to the Eastern  
 24 District of California. Def. Cliff's Mot. to Dismiss 1, *AmFree*, ECF No. 126. Briefing on the  
 25 motion to dismiss will be completed by October 1. Minute Order, *AmFree*, ECF No. 136.

26

27

---

28       <sup>2</sup> For ease of reference, Plaintiff States use *AmFree* for all citations to Docket No. 3:24-cv-50504 (N.D. Ill.).

1           In light of the above, *AmFree* does not presently include “all or a material part of the same  
 2 subject matter.” L.R. 3-13(a). Nor is the overlap in parties currently substantial, *see id.*, as  
 3 *AmFree* involves only a single plaintiff (who is a movant-intervenor here) and a single defendant  
 4 (a California official who, as noted, maintains that the plaintiff cannot hale him into court in the  
 5 Northern District of Illinois). Thus, this case should not be transferred to the Northern District of  
 6 Illinois as doing so would not serve the purposes of the transfer statutes. *See* L.R. 3-13(b)(3)(C).

7           **C. PLAINTIFF STATES’ POSITION ON TRANSFER PURSUANT TO L.R. 3-13(B)(3)(C)**

8           This Court is Plaintiff States’ chosen forum, and this suit predates *Daimler*. Plaintiff States  
 9 nonetheless acknowledge that this case and *Daimler* involve substantial “overlap of subject  
 10 matter and/or parties,” such that transfer may be appropriate in the Court’s discretion. L.R. 3-  
 11 13(a), (b)(3)(B), (b)(3)(C).

12           As the California defendants’ opposition to the *Daimler* plaintiffs’ preliminary injunction  
 13 motion demonstrates, questions about the validity and purported legal force of the Resolutions are  
 14 material, if not central, to the disposition of many (though not all) of the *Daimler* plaintiffs’  
 15 claims. Thus, Plaintiff States’ claims here—that the Resolutions are unlawful—are operating as  
 16 defenses in *Daimler*; and the two cases involve overlapping subject matter. *Compare* Compl. ¶¶  
 17 153-176, *with* Ex. C at 20-32. Plaintiff States anticipate that the reply briefs on the preliminary  
 18 injunction motion in *Daimler*, due September 30, 2025, will underscore the point. The cases also  
 19 share “substantially all of the same parties.” L.R. 3-13(a). Plaintiff State California brought this  
 20 suit by and through Attorney General Rob Bonta, Governor Gavin Newsom, and CARB. Compl.  
 21 ¶ 14. Steven S. Cliff, in his official capacity as the Executive Officer of CARB, is a named  
 22 *Daimler* defendant.<sup>3</sup> The United States is a party to both actions (opposite the California parties).

23           Given this overlap in subject matter and parties, Plaintiff States acknowledge that transfer  
 24 of this case to the Eastern District may be warranted under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) to “avoid  
 25 conflicts, conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action.” L.R. 3-  
 26 13(b)(3)(C); *see also AlexSam, Inc. v. WageWorks, Inc.*, No. 19-cv-04538-EMC, 2020 WL

27           <sup>3</sup> The *Daimler* suit also names Governor Newsom and CARB as defendants. *Supra* at  
 28 2:20-23. However, the California defendants intend to move to dismiss those parties. Defs.’ Resp.  
 to Order to Show Cause 5-6, *Daimler*.

1       13891310, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2020) (“compelling interest in avoiding duplicative and  
 2 potentially inconsistent rulings” justified transfer under section 1404(a)). Though this is the first-  
 3 filed case, and Plaintiff States’ choice to file this action in the Northern District is entitled to  
 4 deference, *see Lou v. Belzberg*, 834 F.2d 730, 739 (9th Cir. 1987), Plaintiff States recognize that  
 5 public policy strongly favors litigating related cases in the same court because it “lead[s] to  
 6 judicial economy and efficiency” and “assure[s] consistent rulings,” *Bear River Band of*  
 7 *Rohnerville Rancheria v. California*, No. 20-cv-05574-WHA, 2020 WL 6270929, at \*2 (N.D.  
 8 Cal. Oct. 26, 2020); *see also Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Mosaid Techs. Inc.*, No. 11-cv-6264-PJH,  
 9 2012 WL 1029572, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2012) (court with first-filed action has discretion  
 10 not to apply first-to-file rule, based on factors analogous to those considered under 28 U.S.C.  
 11 § 1404(a)). The *Daimler* court has declined to transfer and so that case will continue to be heard  
 12 in the Eastern District. *Supra* at 3:27-28. Plaintiff States therefore recognize that there may be  
 13 efficiency gains from transferring this matter to the Eastern District, where venue is also proper.  
 14 *See Compl. ¶ 31* (alleging venue based on where State of California resides, pursuant to 28  
 15 U.S.C. § 1391(e)); *California v. Azar*, 911 F.3d 558, 570 (9th Cir. 2018) (state with multiple  
 16 judicial districts “‘resides’ in every district within its borders”). Plaintiff States also acknowledge  
 17 that this matter “is still at a relatively early stage and has not been extensively litigated in this  
 18 district.” *Doornbos v. Pilot Travel Ctrs. LLC*, No. 04-cv-00044, 2005 WL 6167730, at \*5 (S.D.  
 19 Cal. Aug. 16, 2005).<sup>4</sup>

20

21

22

---

23       <sup>4</sup> Local Rule 3-13(b)(3)(C) directs parties to address “whether transfer should be effected  
 24 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (Multi District Litigation Procedures) or whether other  
 25 coordination” might serve the rule’s purposes. Because transfer may be appropriate under 28  
 26 U.S.C. § 1404(a)—which would allow for coordination of this suit and *Daimler* for the pendency  
 27 of both cases—the Court need not analyze transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 15 Wright &  
 28 Miller, Federal Practice & Procedure § 3862 (4th ed., updated May 21, 2025) (section 1407  
 applies more broadly than section 1404(a) because it “is solely for pretrial proceedings”).  
 Moreover, transfer to a district other than the Eastern District of California would not serve the  
 purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1407, as it would be inconvenient for Plaintiff States given both the Bay  
 Area residency of counsel for the lead State (California) and the Sacramento headquarters of the  
 relevant state agency (CARB).

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this suit and the *Daimler* suit share substantially overlapping subject matter and/or parties. Despite this Court being Plaintiff States' chosen forum, Plaintiff States acknowledge that, to "avoid conflicts, conserve resources and promote an efficient determination" of both cases, transfer may be appropriate. L.R. 3-13(b)(3)(C).

Dated: September 26, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ROB BONTA  
Attorney General of California  
MYUNG J. PARK  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Cecilia D. Segal  
CECILIA D. SEGAL  
Deputy Attorney General  
455 Golden Gate Ave., Ste. 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 510-3545  
Fax: (510) 622-2270  
E-mail: [Cecilia.Segal@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Cecilia.Segal@doj.ca.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California*

**PHILIP J. WEISER**  
*Attorney General for the State of Colorado*

**KATHLEEN JENNINGS**  
*Attorney General of the State of Delaware*

/s/ Carrie Noteboom  
CARRIE NOTEBOOM\*  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
1300 Broadway, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
(720) 508-6285  
[carrie.noteboom@coag.gov](mailto:carrie.noteboom@coag.gov)

By: /s/ Vanessa L. Kassab  
IAN R. LISTON  
Director of Impact Litigation  
RALPH K. DURSTEIN III  
VANESSA L. KASSAB\*  
Deputy Attorneys General  
Delaware Department of Justice  
820 N. French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 683-8899  
[vanessa.kassab@delaware.gov](mailto:vanessa.kassab@delaware.gov)

1           **ANDREA JOY CAMPBELL**  
 2           *Attorney General for the Commonwealth  
                 of Massachusetts*

3           /s/ Seth Schofield  
 4           SETH SCHOFIELD \*  
 5           Senior Appellate Counsel  
 6           JON WHITNEY\*  
 7           Special Assistant Attorney General  
 8           Energy and Environment Bureau  
 9           Office of the Attorney General  
 10           One Ashburton Place, 18th Flr.  
 11           Boston, Mass. 02108  
 12           (617) 727-2200  
 13           [seth.schofield@mass.gov](mailto:seth.schofield@mass.gov)  
 14           [jon.whitney@mass.gov](mailto:jon.whitney@mass.gov)

11           **MATTHEW J. PLATKIN**  
 12           *Attorney General for the State of New Jersey*

13           /s/ Lisa J. Morelli  
 14           LISA J. MORELLI  
 15           Deputy Attorney General  
 16           New Jersey Division of Law  
 17           25 Market Street  
 18           Trenton, New Jersey 08625  
 19           (609) 376-2740  
 20           [Lisa.Morelli@law.njoag.gov](mailto:Lisa.Morelli@law.njoag.gov)

19           **RAÚL TORREZ**  
 20           *Attorney General for the State of New  
                 Mexico*

21           /s/ William Grantham  
 22           WILLIAM GRANTHAM\*  
 23           Assistant Attorney General  
 24           408 Galisteo Street  
 25           Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501  
 26           (505) 717-3520  
 27           [wgrantham@nmdoj.gov](mailto:wgrantham@nmdoj.gov)

1           **LETITIA JAMES**  
 2           *Attorney General for the State of New York*

3           /s/ Ashley M. Gregor  
 4           ASHLEY M. GREGOR\*  
 5           Assistant Attorney General  
 6           Environmental Protection Bureau  
 7           28 Liberty Street, 19th Floor  
 8           New York, NY 10005  
 9           (212) 416-8454  
 10           [ashley.gregor@ag.ny.gov](mailto:ashley.gregor@ag.ny.gov)

11           **DAN RAYFIELD**  
 12           *Attorney General for the State of Oregon*

13           /s/ Paul Garrahan  
 14           PAUL GARRAHAN\*  
 15           Sr. Assistant Attorney General  
 16           Oregon Department of Justice  
 17           1162 Court Street NE  
 18           Salem, Oregon 97301-4096  
 19           (503) 947-4540  
 20           [Paul.Garrahan@doj.oregon.gov](mailto:Paul.Garrahan@doj.oregon.gov)

19           **PETER F. NERONHA**  
 20           *Attorney General for the State of Rhode  
                 Island*

21           /s/ Nicholas M. Vaz  
 22           NICHOLAS M. VAZ\*  
 23           Special Assistant Attorney General  
 24           Office of the Attorney General  
 25           Chief, Environmental and Energy Unit  
 26           150 South Main Street  
 27           Providence, Rhode Island 02903  
 28           (401) 274-4400 ext. 2297  
 29           [nvaz@riag.ri.gov](mailto:nvaz@riag.ri.gov)

1  
2     **CHARITY R. CLARK**  
3     *Attorney General for the State of Vermont*

4     /s/ Hannah Yindra  
5     HANNAH YINDRA\*  
6     Assistant Attorney General  
7     Office of the Attorney General  
8     109 State Street  
9     Montpelier, VT 05609  
10    (802) 828-3186  
11    [Hannah.Yindra@vermont.gov](mailto:Hannah.Yindra@vermont.gov)

12     **NICHOLAS W. BROWN**  
13     *Attorney General for the State of Washington*

14     /s/ Alexandria Doolittle  
15     ALEXANDRIA K. DOOLITTLE\*  
16     Assistant Attorney General  
17     Office of the Attorney General  
18     P.O. Box 40117  
19     Olympia, Washington 98504-0117  
20     (360) 586-6769  
21     [Alex.Doolittle@atg.wa.gov](mailto:Alex.Doolittle@atg.wa.gov)

22     *\*Admitted pro hac vice*

23     Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i), I attest that all signatories to this document concurred in its filing.

24     /s/ Cecilia D. Segal  
25     Cecilia D. Segal  
26     Counsel for Plaintiff State of California

27     OK2025401237  
28     44812984